

REMARKS

This response is to the Office Letter mailed in the above-referenced case on March 23, 2006. Claims 13-23 are standing for examination. The Examiner objects to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The Examiner objects to the specification. The abstract is objected to by the Examiner for containing over 150 words. Claims 15, 18, 21 and 22 are objected to because of informalities. The Examiner states the claims are generally narrative and indefinite and requires correction. Claim 13 is rejected under 35U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

In response to the Examiner's objections and rejections, the applicant herein amends the claims, specification and drawings in order to overcome the objections and rejections.

Regarding the objections to the drawings, applicant submits replacement sheets with drawing corrections for Figures 2 and 25. Applicant amends the specification to overcome the remainder of the drawing objections not corrected with the red-lined drawings. Applicant points out that the Examiner's objection of Fig. 10 seems to be unfounded as the figure clearly shows element 209 and it is adequately described in the specification on page 54, lines 10-11. Also, the specification does not refer to element 181 as in Fig. 11, but in Fig. 8. The applicant has amended the spec., however, to avoid any confusion on this point. Still further, the Examiner's contention that element 69 has been used to represent both "application" and "layer" also appears to be incorrect. There is one instance of element 67 used with "application", but element 69 is used consistently for "layer". Still further, the Examiner's contention that element 19 from Fig. 8 is missing in the description also appears to be incorrect. That element number appears on page 11, line 1.

Regarding the specification, applicant herein amends the specification to overcome the Examiner's objections. The applicant has also provided a corrected Abstract by amendment. Claim objections for claims 15, 18, 21 and 22 and the 112 rejection of claim 13 are also overcome by amendment.

In regard to the Examiner's comment that the claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform to current US practice, the applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to provide the portions of 35 U.S.C. or 37 C.F.R., or other document of the USPTO that states the "practice" to which the Examiner refers. The applicant concedes that the specification and the claims both have a few grammatical and spelling errors, and the hyphen was most assuredly over used. The structure of the claims in general, however, is in accordance with the undersigned agent's understanding of US practice, and the US Patent Office has issued thousands of patents with claim language following this general structure. Furthermore, the applicant respectfully objects to the comment that the claims appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document. That comment was unnecessary.

In addition, the applicant notes there are no merit rejections in the action, but is reluctant to assume that the Examiner has found no art upon which to construct a rejection. Now that the English lesson is finished, we expect to see, and respectfully request, Examination on the merits in the next action.

If there are any time extensions needed beyond any extension specifically requested with this amendment, such extension of time is hereby requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with this amendment, authorization is given to deduct such fees from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully Submitted,
Srihari Kumar et al.

By /Donald R. Boys/
Donald R. Boys
Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency
P.O. Box 187
Aromas, CA 95004
(831) 726-1457